

**LEGISLATIVE SERVICES AGENCY
OFFICE OF FISCAL AND MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS**

200 W. Washington, Suite 301
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 233-0696
<http://www.in.gov/legislative>

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

LS 6173

BILL NUMBER: SB 23

NOTE PREPARED: Feb 19, 2010

BILL AMENDED: Feb 18, 2010

SUBJECT: Unemployment Contribution Rates.

FIRST AUTHOR: Sen. Hershman

FIRST SPONSOR: Rep. Niezgodski

BILL STATUS: CR Adopted - 2nd House

FUNDS AFFECTED: **GENERAL**
 X DEDICATED
 FEDERAL

IMPACT: State & Local

Summary of Legislation: (Amended) *Employer Tax Rates:* The bill delays from January 1, 2010, to January 1, 2011, changes in the taxable wage base and employer contribution rates for the unemployment compensation system.

School and Local Units Controlled Projects: The bill changes the minimum cost of certain controlled projects that may be subject to the local public question process whenever the statewide average unemployment rate in the previous calendar year for the construction industry is 10% or higher.

Alternative Base Period: The bill establishes an alternative method of determining the base period for unemployment compensation benefits.

Maximum Benefit: The bill removes the cap on the amount of wage credits. It limits the amount of an individual's benefit to 55% of the state's average weekly wage.

Family Illness or Disability: The bill provides that an individual who is receiving unemployment benefits may restrict the individual's availability for work because of the individual's need to address matters that qualify as illness or disability of the individual or the individual's spouse, minor child, or parent. The bill also provides that an individual is not disqualified for waiting period or benefit rights because the individual separated or was discharged from employment because of illness or disability of the individual or the individual's spouse, minor child, or parent.

Work Search High Unemployment: The bill suspends the condition that an individual submit at least one application for work in each week for which the individual is claiming benefits for a calendar year whenever

the statewide unemployment rate for the previous calendar year is 7.5% or higher.

Jury Duty: The bill provides that an otherwise eligible individual may not be denied unemployment benefits or determined not able, available, and actively seeking work, because the individual is responding to a summons for jury service. It requires the individual to obtain from the court proof of the individual's jury service and provide to the Department of Workforce Development (DWD), in the manner the department prescribes by rule, proof of the individual's jury service.

Training UI Benefit: The bill provides for a training benefit.

Compliance Center: The bill removes language that requires DWD to establish an Unemployment Claims Compliance Center.

Worker Classification: The bill provides that an individual performing services for a contractor or subcontractor on a construction project is considered to be an employee of the contractor or subcontractor, with certain exceptions. It provides for investigations of the employment relationship between an individual and a contractor or subcontractor by the Department of Labor, for certain procedures to be followed in investigations, and for a civil penalty to be assessed by the Department of Labor for the failure to properly classify individuals as employees. The bill also provides that certain information pertaining to employee classification shared among certain state agencies is confidential. It prohibits the awarding of contracts for certain public work projects to a contractor or subcontractor for four years after the contractor or subcontractor is found to have committed certain recurring improper classifications.

UI Voluntary Contribution: It repeals a provision that permits an employer with a debit reserve ratio to elect once, after December 31, 2009, and before January 1, 2012, to make a voluntary contribution to the fund and receive a credit to the employer's account equal to 250% of the amount of the voluntary contribution.

Effective Date: Upon passage; January 1, 2010 (retroactive); July 1, 2010.

Explanation of State Expenditures: *Employer Tax Rates:* The provision delaying the new rate schedule would not affect the state expenditures to the Unemployment Insurance Benefit Fund since the state is a reimbursable employer.

(Revised) *Compliance Center:* Repealing the Unemployment Claims Compliance Center would not have a saving since the federal government said that the implementation would make the state noncompliant and DWD has not implemented the center.

(Revised) *Alternative Base Period:* The establishment of an alternative base would have a minor impact on the state as an employer, but would increase the expenditures from the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. The estimates for the increase in fund expenditures varies from \$25.5 M by the National Employment Law Project to \$29.1 M by the DWD.

(Revised) *Maximum Benefit:* Based on the average weekly wage of \$728.13 for the 1st quarter of CY 2009, the maximum UI benefit would be about \$400.47. The current maximum weekly benefit is \$390. The average weekly benefit is about \$294, and about 42% of claimants are receiving the maximum benefit. Based on the CY 2009 claims additional expenditures from the UI Trust Fund could be about \$32.7 M.

(Revised) *Family Illness or Disability:* The additional cost to the UI Fund, assuming an approximate 1%

increase in claims, based on the CY 2009 data ,would be about \$18 M annually. The estimates of the additional cost to the UI Fund varies from \$2.5 M by the National Employment Law Project to \$32 M by the Department of Workforce Development.

(Revised) *Work Search High Unemployment*: The provision to eliminate the weekly job search requirement to collect unemployment benefits if the unemployment rate is above 10% would probably have minor impact on the state as an employer. The provision could increase the benefits paid from the fund, depending on the number of claimants that get a job due to the required weekly job search. Data is not available for the number of claimants that find a job due to the job search requirement. The total benefits paid out in CY 2009 was about \$1,865.3 M, so each 1% increase in the payout from the UI Fund due to the elimination of the job search requirement would be about \$18 M.

(Revised) *Jury Duty*: The impact on the state as an employer would be minor. The impact on the UI Trust Fund would also probably be minor.

(Revised) *Training UI Benefit*: The bill provides for a training benefit. It is unknown how many may receive benefits by enrolling in a training program after they have exhausted their benefits. The impact would depend on the length of the training program and the number of claimants choosing the training. If 5% of the claimants that left the unemployment roll in CY 2009 chose to apply for five weeks of training, the cost to the UI Fund would be about \$56.5 M.

(Revised) *Worker Classification*: The impact on the Department of Labor will depend on the number of complaints filed. The Department of Labor would also be able to issue cease work orders for projects for which the contractor has misclassified employees. The bill's requirements represent an additional workload on the agency outside of the agency's routine administrative functions, and existing staffing and resource levels, if currently being used to capacity, may be insufficient for full implementation. The Department of Labor reports that they would need four additional investigators at \$45,855, an assistant at \$36,800, an administrative law judge, and a court reporter two days a month at \$27,300, a part-time attorney from the Attorney General's office to prosecute cases three days a week, and about \$33,800 in miscellaneous costs. The increase in cost would be about \$321,320 annually. The additional funds and resources required could be supplied through existing staff and resources currently being used in another program or with new appropriations. Ultimately, the source of funds and resources required to satisfy the requirements of this bill will depend on legislative and administrative actions.

The bill establishes the nonreverting Employee Classification Fund for the purposes of administering these provisions, investigating contractors and agents of contractors, and for funding other expenses incurred in carrying out the duties of the department regarding employee classification. The fund consists of civil penalties collected for employee classification violations.

The bill provides for the Department of Labor, the Department of Workforce Development, and the Worker's Compensation Board to develop a joint computer system in order to share information on employee classification information by January 1, 2011. There could be some additional cost with developing the system to share information. Revenue from the Employee Classification Fund could be used to develop the system.

Background: The state paid about \$4.1 M in FY 2009, \$4.1 M in FY 2008, and \$5.9 M in FY 2007 to the Unemployment Insurance Fund as an employer.

Explanation of State Revenues: (Revised) *Alternative Base Period & Family Illness or Disability & Training UI Benefit:* If the state implemented the alternative base period calculation, allow an individual to receive benefits when the individual or family member has an illness or disability, and continue to receive benefits when in approved training, the state could receive \$148 M in one-time federal stimulus revenue to the UI Fund to pay UI benefits.

Employer Tax Rates: The bill would reduce the revenue to the Unemployment Insurance Benefit Trust Fund. The reduction in revenue in FY 2010 is estimated to be between \$314 M and \$357.6 M.

(Revised) *Worker Classification:* The bill raises the filing fee collected by the Department of State Revenue for an independent contractor from \$5 to \$25. The bill would increase the revenue for the Independent Contractor Information Account in the state General Fund. The \$5 filing fee has generated between \$32,700 and \$39,380 over the last five years. Increasing the fee to \$25 would raise between \$163,500 and \$196,900.

Civil penalties of \$1,000 per employee may be assessed by the Department of Labor on employers who improperly classify employees and refuse to correct the problem. The revenue would be deposited into the Employee Classification Fund, and the revenue will depend on the number of violations found by the Department of Labor.

UI Voluntary Contribution: The repeal of the provision that permits an employer with a debit reserve ratio to elect once, after December 31, 2009, and before January 1, 2012, to make a voluntary contribution to the fund and receive a credit to the employer's account equal to 250% of the amount of the voluntary contribution could reduce contributions into the fund. The balance of all debit reserve ratio employers is about -\$1.8 B. Each 1% of voluntary contributions employers might have made would have generated \$18 M of one-time income to the fund, and employers would receive a reduction in their negative balance of about \$45 M.

(Revised) *Background:* The following is the amount states have borrowed as of February 16, 2010, from the federal government to pay unemployment benefits.

Alabama	\$200,724,827.22
Arkansas	\$278,833,916.95
California	\$7,119,365,227.37
Colorado	\$45,105,000.00
Connecticut	\$295,261,478.04
Florida	\$1,239,100,000.00
Georgia	\$199,000,000.00
Idaho	\$140,635,625.22
Illinois	\$1,582,176,341.88
Indiana	\$1,649,784,846.70
Kentucky	\$661,600,000.00
Massachusetts	\$41,864,979.06
Michigan	\$3,447,282,333.32
Minnesota	\$416,813,948.76
Missouri	\$556,229,802.21
Nevada	\$219,476,394.20
New Jersey	\$1,209,701,783.38
New York	\$2,462,228,500.81

North Carolina	\$1,850,837,380.30
Ohio	\$1,955,417,799.00
Pennsylvania	\$2,307,662,071.16
Rhode Island	\$158,971,517.00
South Carolina	\$771,287,283.00
South Dakota	\$12,944,423.67
Texas	\$1,628,708,179.95
Virgin Islands	\$11,671,975.08
Virginia	\$204,192,171.00
Wisconsin	\$1,130,986,340.34
Total	\$31,797,864,145.62

For CY 2009 the Unemployment Insurance Benefit Fund received \$521.4 M from employers, \$0.5 M in interest, paid \$1,865.3 M in benefits, and had administrative expenses of \$14.9 M. The ending balance on December 30, 2009, was a negative \$1,469.8 M. The loans to states from the federal government for unemployment benefits will not begin accruing interest until at least December 31, 2010.

Explanation of Local Expenditures: (Revised) The impact on local government of changes to the unemployment insurance benefits and contribution rates would be as an employer.

Explanation of Local Revenues: (Revised) *School and Local Units Controlled Projects* Under current law, a capital project is considered a controlled project if it will cost the political subdivision more than the lesser of (1) \$2 M or (2) an amount equal to 1% of the total gross assessed value of property within the political subdivision on the last assessment date (if that amount is at least \$1 M).

A controlled project for a school building for kindergarten through Grade 8 is subject to a referendum if the cost is more than \$10 M. A controlled project for a school building for Grade 9 through Grade 12 is subject to a referendum if the cost is more than \$20 M. Other controlled projects with a cost that exceeds the lesser of (1) \$12 M or (2) 1% of the assessed value (but at least \$1 M) are also subject to a referendum.

Under this provision, the thresholds for requiring a referendum would be increased if the previous year's statewide average unemployment rate for the construction industry is at least 10%. In that case, a referendum would be required if the cost exceeds \$15 M for a kindergarten through Grade 8 project, \$30 M for a high school project, or for all other projects, the lesser of (1) \$18 M or (2) 1.5% of the assessed value (but at least \$1 M). Projects that exceed the normal thresholds but are within the higher thresholds would be subject to the petition and remonstrance process when construction unemployment exceeds 10%. Currently, there is no construction unemployment rate calculated for the state of Indiana by DWD or the U.S. Department of Labor. The U.S. Census Bureau (on behalf of the U.S. Department of Labor) does generate monthly estimates of the national unemployment rate by occupation using the Current Population Survey.

Property tax levies used to pay debt or lease/rentals that were approved in a referendum are exempt from the property tax circuit breaker caps. If not approved through a referendum, the levy is subject to the caps. This provision could make it easier to approve some projects when construction unemployment exceeds 10%. However, the levies for these projects would be subject to the circuit breaker caps which could affect property tax collection rates for the taxing unit building the project and for all overlapping taxing units.

State Agencies Affected: DWD.

Local Agencies Affected: Local units.

Information Sources: DWD data.

Fiscal Analyst: Chuck Mayfield, 317-232-4825.